

**Minutes of a Special Session of the Common Council of the Town of Clarkdale
Held on Tuesday, May 22, 2018 at 3:00 P.M.**

A Special Meeting of the Common Council of the Town of Clarkdale was held on Tuesday, May 22, 2018, at 3:00 P.M. in the Clark Memorial Clubhouse, Men's Lounge, 19 N. Ninth Street, Clarkdale, Arizona.

CALL TO ORDER – Meeting was called to order at 3:00 P.M. by Mayor Von Gausig.

Town Council:

Mayor Doug Von Gausig
Vice Mayor Richard Dehnert
Councilmember Scott Buckley

Councilmember Bill Regner
Councilmember Ben Kramer

Town Staff:

Town Manager Gayle Mabery
Community Development/Economic Director Jodie Filardo
Utilities/Public Works Director Maher Hazine
Administrative Services Director Kathy Bainbridge
Finance Manager Kathy Cwiok
Human Resources Manager Lonnie Hovde
Police Chief Randy Taylor
Court Supervisor Brenda Schorr
Town Clerk Mary Ellen Dunn

Citizen Bond Committee:

Peter deBlanc
Bob Backus
Michael Lindner
Jimmy Salmon

PUBLIC COMMENT – The Town Council invites the public to provide comments at this time. Members of the Council may not discuss items that are not specifically identified on the agenda. Therefore, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.01(G), action taken as a result of public comment will be limited to directing staff to study the matter, responding to any criticism or scheduling the matter for further consideration and decision at a later date. Persons interested in making a comment on a specific agenda item are asked to complete a brief form and submit it to the Town Clerk during the meeting. Each speaker is asked to limit their comments to five minutes.

There was no public comment.

CONSENT AGENDA - The consent agenda portion of the agenda is a means of expediting routine matters that must be acted on by the Council. All items are approved with one motion. Any items may be removed for discussion at the request of any Council Member.

- A. **Reports** - Approval of written Reports from Town Departments and Other Agencies
Building Permit Report – April, 2018
Capital Improvements Report – April, 2018
Water and Wastewater Report – March, 2018
Police Department Report – April, 2018
Special Event Liquor License Recommendations: Verde Valley Wine Festival and
Downtown Block Parties
CAT/LYNX Transit Report – April, 2018

Action: Approve Consent Agenda item A as presented.

Motion: Vice Mayor Dehnert

Second: Councilmember Regner

Vote Passed Unanimously

NEW BUSINESS

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM CITIZENS COMMITTEE RELATING TO THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PUBLIC STREET IMPROVEMENTS/REPAIRS – Discussion and possible direction to staff regarding the Citizens Road/Street Improvement Bond Committee's recommendations with regard to a November, 2018 General Obligation Bond Election.

During their Strategic Planning process in 2016, the Clarkdale Town Council directed staff to pursue the development of a comprehensive plan to address the capital improvements, safety and on-going maintenance needs of the Town's public road system and explore potential funding alternatives to sustainably address these costs into the future.

In May, 2017, the Town Council approved a proposal from Kimley-Horn Engineering to prepare a comprehensive road condition assessment and a cost analysis for a Capital Improvement Plan and an on-going maintenance and preservation plan for Clarkdale's public roads and streets. Kimley-Horn presented the results of their work to the Town Council at the December 12, 2017 Council meeting. This presentation and discussion was the first in a series of 5 public meetings where the Council and staff continued to evaluate options to fund the expenses associated with *the capital improvements, safety and on-going maintenance needs of the Town's public road system.*

Central to the Council's discussions from December, 2017 – February, 2018 was the development of street repair and improvements that were based on realistic funding expectations for Clarkdale. The estimated costs for the capital improvements phase of the project that were discussed with the Town Council ranged from \$5.3M to \$14.7M, and varied depending on the construction methods selected for repairs and improvements.

After reviewing various combinations of funding options, the Council determined that a General Obligation Bond, backed by a secondary property tax, was the appropriate method to consider funding the capital improvement portion of the Street Repair/Improvement Program. The current bonding capacity available to the Town of Clarkdale under this method is \$10,757,931.

Grant Hamill, with the Town's Investment Banking firm Stifel, Nicolaus & Company provided the Town Council with the following information relating to General Obligation Bonds:

- G.O. Bonds are commonly issued by cities and towns to fund capital improvement projects
- Approval by a majority of voters is required for issuance of these bonds, and the election must be held in November of any given year
- Funds for the repayment of the bonds come through a Secondary Property Tax
- The amount of the tax paid is based on the Secondary Tax Rate and the assessed value of the property being assessed
- The Town of Clarkdale currently has no outstanding G.O. Bonds
- G.O. bonding capacity can grow as Net Full Cash Assessed Value increases and as any outstanding G.O. principal is retired
- Stifel recommends that the Town consider appointing a Citizen's Bond Committee to help review the bond proposal if the Town chooses to pursue this option

During their February 27, 2018 meeting, the Town Council directed the staff to move forward with the formation of Citizen's Committee to review information relating to the Street Repairs/Improvements, and make recommendations to the Town Council on whether or not to pursue a General Obligation Bond election, and, if so, under what parameters.

Citizen volunteers applied to serve on a Town Manager appointed advisory committee and were appointed at the end of March, 2018. The Committee, who are all residents and property owners in Clarkdale, met throughout April and May, 2018 and undertook a comprehensive information/data assessment process, which included the following topics:

- History and status of public roads in Clarkdale
- Federal, State and Local policies and issues that have impacted the funding for road improvement
- Current and past Street/Road revenues and expenses in Clarkdale
- Kimley-Horn road condition assessment and recommendations for repair and improvements under a Comprehensive Pavement Management Plan
- Review of alternate revenue options to funding street/road repair and improvements
- Consultation with Town's Investment Banking firm on various General Obligation Bond options to fund a road/street capital improvement program. The maximum bonding capacity for Clarkdale is \$10.7 million, and the Committee's discussions focused on a range of options from \$4-8 million
- Review of methods to ensure sustainable funding for on-going Pavement Maintenance and Preservation

2018 Citizens Street Repair/Improvement Committee Members

Bob Backus

Peter deBlanc

Jane "Jai" Hurst

Michael Lindner

Jimmy Salmon

Roy Sandoval

Sheila Sandusky

Ray Selna

Working with the Citizens Committee and our consulting engineer, the Town Staff continued to refine the recommended repairs and improvements, and developed a plan that addresses the capital, preservation and safety improvements necessary for the majority of the public streets in the Town of Clarkdale.

The recommended approach relies on a combination of routine pavement preservation and advanced pavement treatment (including comprehensive road edge treatments) which will add years to the life of the majority of our public roads at less than half the cost of the first strategy that was explored with the Town Council.

After their information/data assessment, and including consideration of the recommended approach for routine pavement preservation and advanced pavement treatment, the Citizen's Committee developed the following recommendations for the Clarkdale Town Council:

Citizens Street Repair/Improvement Committee Recommendations:

The Clarkdale Town Council should call for a General Obligation Bond Election in November 2018, for the issuance of bonds payable from Secondary Property Tax for the purpose of Public Street Repairs/Improvements.

The principal amount of indebtedness should not exceed \$6,000,000 and should mature not more than 10 years from their date of issuance.

We strongly recommend that a dedicated funding source for on-going maintenance and preservation be allocated with sufficient funding to ensure a sustainable Pavement Management Program for Clarkdale.

On behalf of the Council and the Bond Committee, Stifel, Nicolaus & Company prepared a scenario to project estimated debt service requirements and projected impact on Secondary Tax Rates based on the Committee's recommendations for the principal amount of \$6M with a 10-year maturity for the bond. The complete scenario is included as an attachment in your Council packet. The following tables illustrate the estimated annual and monthly cost to taxpayers, including principal and interest, based on varying types of property, property values and assessed values.

RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY (Assessed at 10.0%)			
Value for Tax Purposes (a)	2018/19 Assessed Value	Estimated Average Annual Cost (b)	Estimated Average Monthly Cost (b)
\$152,600 (c)	\$15,260 (c)	\$352.87	\$29.41
100,000	10,000	231.24	19.27

COMMERCIAL PROPERTY (Assessed at 18.0%)			
Value for Tax Purposes (a)	2018/19 Assessed Value	Estimated Average Annual Cost (b)	Estimated Average Monthly Cost (b)
\$258,194 (c)	\$46,475 (c)	\$1,074.69	\$89.56
1,000,000	180,000	4,162.32	346.86

AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER VACANT PROPERTY (Assessed at 15.0%)			
Value for Tax Purposes (a)	2018/19 Assessed Value	Estimated Average Annual Cost (b)	Estimated Average Monthly Cost (b)
\$21,793 (c)	\$3,269 (c)	\$75.59	\$6.30
100,000	15,000	346.86	28.91

- (a) Assessor's value for tax purposes is the value of your property as it appears on your tax bill and does not necessarily represent the market value. Beginning with fiscal year 2015/16, this value cannot increase by more than 5% from the prior year in if the property has not changed. For commercial property, only locally assessed property is subject to this limit.
- (b) Cost based on the estimated average tax rate over the life of the bond issues and a number of other financing assumptions which are subject to change.
- (c) Estimated average assessed value of owner-occupied residential properties, commercial properties or agricultural and vacant properties, as applicable, within the Town as provided by the Arizona Department of Revenue.

Should the Town Council choose to pursue this option, an updated analysis will be required, and the details of that analysis would be included in a publicity pamphlet that would be sent to all registered voters preceding the election.

Utilities/Public Works Director Maher Hazine presented information on this agenda item.

Mayor Von Gausig asked Hazine to review the periodic maintenance schedule and cost comparisons between on-going maintenance and periodic large maintenance/advance treatment projects.

Mabery noted that the decision to go with the ten year bond period was based on advice from the bond counsel.

Council discussion followed regarding upgrade time frames, coordination of repair and maintenance with heavy truck traffic from the Verde Soil Project, comparison of Clarkdale's roads with other municipalities facing same issues, and repair recommendations.

Council thanked the committee for all their work and stated they made some wise decisions. Named each of the members and noted that some of these folks don't live on any of these roads that need repair but are recommending a bond vote that will require they pay taxes on roads that won't benefit them personally. Invited committee members to come forward.

Michael Lindner, Clarkdale resident and committee member – commended members of the committee, noted that the streets are in a dire strait, supports general obligation bond vote.

Peter deBlanc, Clarkdale resident and committee member – read a statement supporting the recommendation to present the obligation bond to the voter to Clarkdale. This bond is substantial and will result in a 20% increase property tax. Though unaffordable to many and believes it is important for the voters to understand what the meaning of this bond is.

Jimmy Salmon, Clarkdale resident and committee member – spoke in favor of general obligation bond

Bob Backus, Clarkdale resident and committee member – spoke in favor of go bond – although he dislikes the tax increase, he doesn't know what the Town would do if it doesn't pass.

Jane “Jai” Hurst, Clarkdale resident and committee member – provided letter to council in favor of proposed bond election

Action: The Clarkdale Citizens Street Repair/Improvement Committee recommends that the Town Council:

- **Direct staff to prepare the documents and actions necessary for the Town Council to call for a General Obligation Bond Election in November, 2018 for the issuance of bonds payable from Secondary Property Tax for the purpose of Public Street Repairs/Improvements with:**
 - **A principle amount not exceed \$6M, and,**
 - **A maturity of not more than 10 years from the date of issuance.**

Further, the Town staff recommends that the Council:

- **Direct staff to phase 100% of the Town's allocation of State-Shared Motor Vehicle License Tax Revenue into the Town's Street/Roads fund beginning in Fiscal Year 2019 and with a goal to reach the 100% allocation within a 3-year period. The purpose of this funding is to help assure a sustainable Pavement Management Program for our public roads.**

Motion: Councilmember Regner

Second: Vice Mayor Dehnert

Vote: Passed unanimously.

**COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN TOWN OF CLARKDALE AND ARIZONA
GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT – Consideration of a Cooperative Agreement to provide**

waterfront locations with loaner life jackets for increased safety of the public while recreating on the Verde River.

In Arizona, all boat types, except sailboards and certain racing shells or rowing skulls, are required to carry one, Coast Guard-approved, wearable life jacket in good and serviceable condition for each person on board and placed so as to be readily accessible for immediate use. Passengers 12 years of age and under are required to wear a Coast Guard-approved, Type I, I or III life jacket when on board any boat that is underway. While many people associate this law with motorized boats, these requirements are also applicable to kayakers and canoers on the Verde River.

One of the Arizona Game and Fish Department's (AZGF) goals is to educate boaters on the significance of wearing the appropriate size and type of life jacket while boating. Another is to make sure a day of boating isn't spoiled just because a family forgot a life jacket at home. And finally, the most important goal: simply to keep boaters safe out on the water! The Arizona Life Jacket Loaner Program is designed to address these important goals, and provides the Town of Clarkdale the opportunity to partner with AZGF on this program at our two river access points in Clarkdale.

Mayor Von Gausig has worked with staff at the Arizona Game and Fish Department to bring this program forward in Clarkdale, and we are excited to be the first project in Arizona where the life jacket loaner program is being deployed to support safe boating between two distinct river access points!

Under the program, Clarkdale will receive 15 various-sized life jackets, as well as a kiosk (see photo of sample kiosk at end of this report) to display the life jackets at each of our two river access points (Lower TAPCO RAP and the Tuzigoot RAP). The life jackets and kiosks will be installed in prominent location near our boat launch locations at each site. A boating family, or other visitors, can then check out the life jacket for a day, free of charge. At the end of the boating trip, they simply return the life jacket to one of our two kiosk locations.

Our Verde River Ambassadors will monitor the life jacket kiosks on a consistent basis to ensure that we continue to have life jackets available at each location. They will move life jackets between the two sites if necessary (i.e. we expect to have boaters who borrow life jackets when they launch at the Lower TAPCO RAP, and then return the life jackets to the Tuzi RAP kiosk).

Under the Agreement, AZGF shall:

1. Have the legal authority to enter into this agreement, and the institutional, managerial, and financial capability to ensure proper planning, management, and completion of the project, which includes funds sufficient to pay the project costs, when applicable.
2. Supply each preapproved waterfront location with fifteen various-sized life jackets as well as a loaner station to display the life jackets
3. Re-supply all lost, stolen, or damaged various-sized life jackets as long as the loaner station and/or agreement are in use.
4. Repair or replacement of Life Jacket Loaner Station if vandalized.

The Town of Clarkdale shall:

1. Coordinate and approve locations and implementation of the Life Jacket Loaner Stations.
2. Have our Verde River Ambassadors, or other designee, inventory, inspect, and restock the Life Jacket Loaner Stations. Town of Clarkdale or designees will inform the Department within a reasonable amount of time for delivery of additional life jackets to meet the requirement.
3. Inform the Department of any vandalism to Life Jacket Loaner Stations.
4. Provide Clarkdale oversight to the project in accordance with Clarkdale specifications.

Having free life jackets available will not only provide immediate protection for the boater, but in cases where the boater is breaking the law by not having their children in life jackets, the vessel operator will not be forced off the water for non-compliance.

Community Services Supervisor Joni Westcott presented information to Council on this topic.

Mayor Von Gausig covered legal aspects of the issue as well as statistics and safety issues. Jackets are funded by Ryan-Thomas Foundation. Stating personal experience, Councilmember Buckley also discussed the importance of using the life jackets.

Action: Approve the Cooperative Agreement between the Town of Clarkdale and the Arizona Game and Fish Department to provide waterfront locations with loaner life jackets for increased safety of the public while recreating on the Verde River.

Motion: Councilmember Buckley

Second: Councilmember Kramer

Vote: Passed unanimously.

A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND COMMON COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF CLARKDALE, ARIZONA, AMENDING RESOLUTION #1548, SETTING FEES FOR THE TOWN OF CLARKDALE BY ADJUSTING COURT ENHANCEMENT FEES – A discussion and possible action of Resolution #1567, increasing the Court Enhancement fees, and deleting references to “Swimming Pool Fees” and “Library Fees”.

Local municipal courts (does not apply to Justice or Superior courts) impose an enhancement fee that is used to offset administrative costs in handling the cases, and is used “to enhance the technological, operational and security capabilities of the court”. It provides a small source of funding that supplements budgeting for these improvements by the Town. The fee is especially important now that all courts in the State are required to review and upgrade court security measures, and there are additional training and operational expenses in implementation of the new AJACS case management system. Allow me to provide an overview of how the Court Enhancement Fee (CEF) works, the issues the fee currently creates, and our request to change the fee.

How it works:

The TOC sets the local court enhancement fee, (currently \$10), which appears to have been set over ten years ago with resolution #1210, in September 2006.

The AZ Office of the Court (AOC) system then applies a surcharge to the local fee as a percentage of the local fee. The current surcharge is 83%. On the \$10.00 fee, the surcharge is \$8.30, making the defendant's total court enhancement fee \$18.30

AOC has from time to time changed the % of the surcharge. For example; 1999-2000, the surcharge was 77%; from 2002-2007, 80%; 2007-2011, 84%; 2012-2018, 83%.

Current issues:

The recent addition of a cash drawer has solved 'at the counter' payments for most, as we can now provide change. However, credit/debit card payments cannot be made at the court and require a phone call or online payment process. Mailed payments require a money order or cashier's check. Often, with both the online and mailed payments, the 0.30 cents is overlooked, which leaves a case open due to a remaining balance. This causes much frustration to the defendant and additional work for the staff.

Request:

Our request to change the fee is driven by two factors. One, is to change the fee to an even dollar amount, after the AOC surcharge is applied. Because the % of the surcharge changes periodically, we need language in the adoption of the new CEF that allows some flexibility, like that allowed by the town prosecutor in setting the deferred prosecution fee.

For example, the council's resolution language could allow the Court Administrator to adjust the CEF to an even dollar amount between \$22 and \$24 dollars, following any change in the percentage charge by AOC.

Applied, it would look like this:

Proposed	\$22.95	Surcharge 83%= \$19.05	Total	\$42.00
----------	---------	------------------------	-------	---------

AZ Court changes surcharge to 84%

Proposed	\$22.82	Surcharge 84%= \$19.18	Total	\$42.00
----------	---------	------------------------	-------	---------

By setting the fee to fluctuate to total an even dollar amount, it will eliminate much client frustration, and staff workload, as well as expedite the closing of cases. When the defendant does not pay the state surcharge (local town ordinances), we would set that at \$22.

Secondly, other municipal/magistrate courts have established CEFs ranging in total (including the AOC surcharge), from \$40-83. This fee applies to all fines, sanctions (civil penalties), assessments and diversion or probation programs. It is only assessed on the final disposition of a case. The \$42.00 recommendation is not an increase from \$10 to \$42, but a change to a range of \$22 – \$24. The difference comes from the AZ Court surcharge of 83% that is added to the local fee. Increasing the fund will support both the current needs and provide a future funding base for changes and improvements.

Our fiscal revenue in FY15-16 was \$3,670, FY16-17 = \$3,755, and FY 17-18, to date totals \$3,440. As shown, there is not a set amount that can be depended on from year to year. Variables are outside of our control. The initial factor rests with the number of charges made by the police department. The total

revenue is also subject to the practice of the prosecutor and magistrate, and how and when defendants pay their fees/fines. It is a fluid amount of monies each year.

The CEF is applied to each charge as opposed to each case, therefore if a citation has four charges, there would be four CEF charges. On criminal charges, the current practice of the prosecutor is to recommend sentencing only one CEF per case, regardless of the number of charges. The Court most often accepts the recommendations of the prosecutor. On civil traffic charges (non-criminal), the CEF is already included on each charge. On town code violations, the CEF does not include the state surcharge. Other than the scenarios above, it is rarely reduced or waived.

It costs money every time an officer makes a traffic stop, every time a prosecutor devotes an hour to a case, every time a defense attorney is appointed, every time a judge steps into a courtroom and every time a charge is processed by a court clerk. The CEF was adopted to force lawbreakers to pay a portion of those costs, rather than having the local community and/or its taxpayers foot the entire bill.

The fund provides a means of budgeting ahead so that the funds are available when the need arises and are not used for recurring annual costs.

Fair Justice for All focuses on providing reasonable time payment options and finding possible alternatives of paying a full sanction at the time of sentencing. Examples of this may include things like a notification system to remind people of court appointments and deadlines, looking at DMV restrictions instead of suspensions, incarceration due to an inability to pay, and possible revision of the base fine schedules used by all courts. These are all issues outside the scope of local fees like the CEF, default and deferred prosecution fees.

Summary:

For the past few years, there has been a great deal of turnover in our court staff, causing a state of chaos for some time. Prior office management was inconsistent and not focused on court improvements. Even during these years, there were existing needs, just not a priority. Since 2017, when I was hired, there has been massive backlogs of inadequate case management and financial responsibilities, as well as a continued change in priorities.

At the end of the FY11-12, our CEF balance was only \$145. It has taken us over 6 years to accumulate the \$11,000 balance that sits there today. Although I have been able to identify some court improvement needs this past year, due to the consistent conversations and uncertainty of relocating or expanding space, we opted to wait until a final decision had been made before expending the necessary funds.

Even with the pending move, there are some needs to be addressed immediately, as well as the unforeseen needs we will have once settled into the new location. Examples include: new front door, a secure clerk window, audio/video terminal and software to link to the jail, security cameras, lobby improvements, scanner, panic alarms, open lateral filing cabinets (2), dual monitors for clerical staff (4), computer software to enhance office functions, a large TV and playback system for evidentiary presentation, signature pads and software, and/or furniture.

To cover the needs above, as well as the security updates that have been mandated, would have required twice what we currently have in our fund. We applied and were awarded the security grant to assist in

the coverage of the security updates, to avoid placing that burden on the Town. It is still a possibility that some of the improvements in the new location can be offset by our security grant funds if we can get permission to redirect a portion of the grant.

Side Note: Swimming pool fees and Library fees are still referenced in the Town of Clarkdale Fee Schedule. Because they are no longer relevant, staff requests that the Council approve deletion of these references.

Court Supervisor Brenda Schorr presented information on this agenda item.

Action: Approval of Resolution #1567, A Resolution of the Mayor and Common Council of the Town of Clarkdale, Arizona, amending Resolution #1548, increasing fees for the Court Enhancement Fees, and deleting references to "Swimming Pool Fees" and "Library Fees".

Motion: Vice Mayor Dehnert

Second: Councilmember Regner

Vote: Passed unanimously.

FISCAL YEAR 2018-2019 PRELIMINARY BUDGET WORKSESSION– A work session with the Council regarding the Preliminary Budget for FY 2018-2019.

This session will be an overall review of the operational budgets for all funds along with the non-operational funds of the Development Reimbursement Fund, Grant Fund and Donation Fund in order to get direction from Council regarding the Official Preliminary Budget which is scheduled for action on June 26, 2018.

Administrative Service Director Kathy Bainbridge and Finance Manager Kathy Cwiok presented information to Council on this agenda item.

2018-2019 Preliminary Operational Budgets:

Fund	Expense Budget	Revenue Budget	Designated Funds
▪ General Fund	\$ 4,220,110.51	\$ 4,220,110.51	
▪ Verde River RAPS	\$ 43,542.54	\$ 43,542.54	
▪ HURF - Streets	\$ 814,366.75	\$ 814,366.75	
▪ Capital Projects Fund	\$ 859,127.06	\$ 859,127.06	\$164,127.06
▪ Wastewater Fund	\$ 538,301.00	\$ 801,533.00	\$263,232.00
▪ WW Plant Expansion	\$ 1,676,896.14	\$ 1,676,896.14	
▪ Water Fund	\$ 952,472.05	\$ 1,452,700.00	\$500,227.95
▪ Water Capital Improvement	\$ 2,603,291.84	\$ 2,603,291.84	
▪ Sanitation Fund	\$ 310,791.85	\$ 325,000.00	\$ 14,208.15
▪ Cemetery Fund	\$ 249,917.96	\$ 249,917.96	
▪ Developer Reimbursement Fund	\$ 706,030.00	\$ 706,030.00	
▪ Grants	\$ 2,404,166.76	\$ 2,404,166.76	
▪ Donations	\$ 670,749.24	\$ 670,749.24	
▪ Court Enhancement Fund	\$ 18,500.00	\$ 18,500.00	

Bainbridge stated she would add the \$6 Million placeholder in the event of the passage of the bond election vote.

Action: This is a worksession only and no action by Council is required.

Without objection Mayor Von Gausig moved to commence Executive Session at 4:44 p.m.

EXECUTIVE SESSION – The Council may vote to discuss the following matters in executive session pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03:

A.R.S. § 38-431.03 (A)(1) – “Discussion or consideration of employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, dismissal, salaries, disciplining or resignation of a public officer, appointee or employee of any public body, except that, with the exception of salary discussions, an officer, appointee or employee may demand that the discussion or consideration occur at a public meeting. The public body shall provide the officer, appointee or employee with written notice of the executive session as is appropriate but not less than twenty-four hours for the officer, appointee or employee to determine whether the discussion or consideration should occur at a public meeting.”

The Executive Session will be held immediately after the vote and will not be open to the public. Upon completion of Executive Session, the Council may resume the meeting, open to the public, to address the remaining items on the agenda.

A. TOWN MANAGER COMPENSATION – A discussion regarding compensation of the Town Manager.

Mayor Von Gausig adjourned the Executive Session at 5:00 p.m.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS - Listing of items to be placed on a future council agenda.

ADJOURNMENT: Without objection Mayor Doug Von Gausig adjourned the meeting at 5:00 P.M.

APPROVED:



Doug Von Gausig, Mayor

ATTESTED/SUBMITTED:



Mary Ellen Dunn, Town Clerk

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing minutes are a true and correct copy of the minutes of the regular meeting of the Town Council of the Town of Clarkdale, Arizona held on the 22nd day of May, 2018. I further certify that meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 12 day of June, 2018.

SEAL

MEDunn
Mary Ellen Dunn, Town Clerk